

*

) ()
. ()

(

(864)

(39)

()

:

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

.7

.1

:

.(2000)

2005/5/27

(2 1)

.(3)

.2006/5/31

*

(1985)

. (Hoveland, 1997) (Gordan, 2000)

.(1986)

.(1990)

()

)

(

.()

.(King, 1993) (Frost, 2000)

.2

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

.7

.1

.2

.1

.2

.3

.1

.2

.3

.1

.2

)

.3

)

(1986)

(12433)
(1387)

:

.3

:

:

.4

:

.5

(1990)

:

.6

:

:

.1

(1992)

.2

.3

.4

.(2005/2004)

.3

(Sonari, 1993)

(76)

(Melbourn, 1994)

(Johnson, 1993)

Winston and Sander

(353)

(30)

(372)

(35)

(1993)

(Hulkonen, 1994)

(38)

(320)

(577)

.1993

(Musing, 1994)

(Newman, 1995)

(Neighbors, 1996)

(295)

:

(441)

)

)

(

.(

%75

(1996)

(51)

()

(956)

(1997)

(1995)

(41)

:

(172)

(335)

:

:

:

(Wright, 2001)

(0.0125 $> \alpha$)

(1997)

(32)

(23)

(10)

1995/1994

SAT

(2823)

(705)

(43)

(50)

(44)

(12)

(16)

(2003)

(199)

(888)

(Lambertze, 1998)

(2004)	:	.1
	.	.2
	.	.3
(77)	.	.4
(470)	.	.5
. 2002/2001		" "
	Sidak	MANOVA
()	:	.1
:		.2
		(0.05)
:		.3
		(0.05)
)		.4
		(0.05)
.(
:		
:		.5
.1		(0.05)
(Musing, (Johnson, 1993) (1990)	(1986)	

.4 (Lambertzi, (1997) (Neighbors, 1996) 1994)
 (2003) (Wright, 2001) 1998)

.2

(Melbourne, (1993) (1992)
 (Newman, 1995) (Hulkonen, 1994) 1994)
 : (1995)

.3

(5449) 2005/2004 ()

. 2005/2004 (1986)
 (4111) (1995) (Melbourn, 1994) (1990)
 (888) : (2003) (Lambertze, 1998) (1997)

(566) (2043)
 (614)

(1338) .4

(511) : (313) (1986)
 (514) (Neighbors, 1996)

.5

%20

(1997) (1996)

(1049) (2004)

(864)

(3) (2) (1) .6

(1) .7

%71.2	615	
%28.8	249	
%100.0	864	

) (5) (2)

() () (2) :

(17)

%8.6	74	
%17.6	152	
%6.3	54	
%9.5	82	
%42.4	366	
%12.5	108	
%3.2	28	
%100.0	864	

()

(3)

(3)

63.9	552	
36.1	312	
100.00	864	

(13)

(26)

:

:

(0.92)

(45)

(15)

:

(0.82)

(0.95)

(30)

()

:

:

:

.1

" "

(7 x 1)

.2

.(2000) (Creswell, 2003).

()

.3

.5

.4

.5

2005 ()

()

(SPSS)

.6

(SPSS)

.1

.2

5.00-3.50

3.49-2.50

2.49-1.50

.3

1.49-1

(4)

(4)

(3.5)

(3.49-2.5)

(4)

(3.25)

(4)

	1	1.21	4.24		7
	2	1.18	4.23		9
	3	1.29	4.12		6
	4	1.28	4.06		8
	5	1.31	3.95		5
	6	1.31	3.90		13
	7	1.38	3.88		10
	7	1.37	3.88		1
	9	1.30	3.83		12
	10	1.31	3.67		3
	11	1.32	3.58		4
	12	1.40	3.55		2
	13	1.53	3.25		11

(4)

(8 6 9 7)

(4 3 2 1)

(5)

-

(5)

(15) (19)

(3.5)

: (4.24)

(3.5)

(3.5)

(5)

)

(1997

(3.5)

(24)

(3.5)

(2.5)

(14)

(5)

(Musing, 1994)

()

(2003)

:

:

:

(5)

	1	1.32	3.53		19
	2	1.40	3.51		15
	3	1.49	3.40		24
	4	1.40	3.29		22
	5	1.42	3.28		16
	6	1.48	3.26		3
	7	1.34	3.24		17
	7	1.51	3.24		14
	9	1.35	3.23		2
	10	1.47	3.22		25
	11	1.64	3.19		10
	12	1.34	3.18		18
	13	1.54	3.17		26
	14	1.43	3.16		5
	15	1.50	3.12		21
	15	1.54	3.12		4
	17	1.39	3.11		13
18	1.63	3.08		23	
18	1.46	3.08		6	

	20	1.37	3.04		1
	21	1.51	3.03		7
	22	1.52	2.98		20
	23	1.55	2.97		11
	24	1.52	2.94		8
	25	1.51	2.84		12
	26	1.51	2.83		9

(0.05) .(.3 (1992)

)

.(

" " " "

:

(Johnson, 1993)

:

:

:

:

" "

:

(6)

(6)

:

(0.05)

.1

(0.05) (0.92) (0.03-)

(0.358) (0.98)

(0.05)

.2

(0.957)

)

(1986)

(1990)

(1995)

(Lambertze, 1998)

)

(1996

:

(2004)

(7)

(2003)

(6)

..

		()						
0.980	856	0.03-	0.68	3.86	0.76	3.86		
0.358	862	0.92	0.83	3.12	0.80	3.17		
0.957	862	0.05	0.62	3.52	0.62	3.53		

(7)

3.86	4.06	3.78	3.84	3.69	3.86	3.94	3.99		
0.73	0.67	0.78	0.74	0.81	0.71	0.71	0.60		
3.16	3.16	3.13	3.25	3.22	3.13	3.92	3.20		
0.81	0.68	0.81	0.78	0.88	0.84	0.84	0.73		
3.52	3.63	3.52	3.56	3.51	3.59	3.39	3.58		
0.62	0.39	0.63	0.60	0.75	0.64	0.62	0.53		

(7)

(4.06)

(Musing, 1994)

(3.92)

(Hulkonen, 1994)

(Newman, 1995)

" "

(8)

One Way ANOVA

(8)

Tukey

(3.15)

" "

(9)

(.6) (857)

(0.005)

(9)

(8)

" "

(1.73) (2.07)

(.0.000)

(0.110) (0.055)

(8)

0.055	2.07	1.11	6	6.65	
		0.54	851	456.02	
		-	857	462.67	
0.005	*3.15	2.03	6	12.16	
		0.64	857	550.91	
		-	863	563.06	
0.110	1.73	0.66	6	3.95	
		0.38	857	325.71	
		-	863	329.66	

.05 > *

(9)

(Tukey)

0.163	0.114	0.283	
0.999	0.144	0.075	
1.000	0.129	0.016	
0.999	0.1022	0.045	
0.997	0.121	0.074	
0.783	0.165	0.237	
0.659	0.127	0.208	
0.094	0.1099	0.299	
*0.000	0.077	*0.3279	
0.37	0.1009	0.209	
0.783	0.1649	0.2366	
0.995	0.1405	0.0918	
0.948	0.1169	0.1201	
1.000	0.1336	0.00121	
1.000	0.1867	0.0288	
1.000	0.098	0.029	
0.988	0.1174	0.089	
1.000	0.1755	0.0619	
0.826	0.0878	0.1189	
0.997	0.1572	0.0913	
1.000	0.1700	0.0276	

0.05 > *

(3.5)

(2043)

(5449)

(511)

(1986)

(10)

(10)

		()					
0.136	862	1.50	0.57	3.93	0.81	3.69	
0.411	862	0.82	0.81	3.07	0.88	3.22	
0.924	862	0.10	0.62	3.52	0.75	3.51	

(10)

(Wright, 2001)

(0.10) (0.82) (1.50) ()

.6

(0.924) (0.411) (0.136)

.1

.2

.3

(Neighbors, 1996)

.4

.7

.5

.8

() ()
() ()
() ()

.6

1997

"

.219-213 :(10)5
2000

1997

.339-329 :(2) 24
1985

() (3)

.566-520
1996

.35-7 :(4)2
2003

1986

"

:(23)

.140-126

1990

1990

.140-126 :(23)
1993

.151-5
2004

.67-15 :(55) 16

1995

.124-105 :(1)31
1984

.117-93 :(8) 4

1992

.115-105 :(3)1
1986

- Abstracts International-A*, 59(4): 1027.
- Melbourne, Dale S. 1994. An Analysis of the Influences of Gender, Race and Age on Student Preferences for the Delivery of Academic Advising Services. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 55(10): 3107.
- Musing, Jonathan N. 1994. A Qualitative Study of problem Female Undergraduate Adult Returning Students Encounter at the University of Maryland at College Park. *Dissertation Abstracts International A.*, 56(14): 1214.
- Neighbors, Elaine J. 1996. The Impact of Early, Regular and Late Registration on Students at Three Texas Colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A.*, 58(3): 771.
- Newman, Nikki A. 1995. Current Trends in Academic Advising of Institutions Accredited by American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A.*, 55(11): 3427.
- Sonari, Jesse A. 1993. The Nature and Extent of the Problems Experienced by International Students Enrolled in an English Language Program. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 55(3), 485.
- Wright, Irvin. 2001. A qualitative Approach to Understanding the Retention and Attrition of Black and White Students is a Special Support Program at Bloomsburg University. *Dissertation Abstract International, A.*, 62(5): 1755.
- 2000
- SPSS
- Creswell, John W. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. New York: SAGE.
- Frost, Susan H. 2000. *Academic Advising for Student Success*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Gordon, Virginia N. 2000. *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Hoveland, Michael. 1997. *Academic Advising for Student Success and Retention*. New York: Noel Levitz.
- Hulkonen, Hune R. 1994. An Analysis of the Academic Advising Concerns of Pre-business Students at the University of South Dakota. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, ss (10): 3105.
- Johnson, Bolton S. 1993. Going Back to School: Characteristics, Motivations, Deterrents and Needs of Adult Male Reentry Students at Community College. *Dissertation Abstracts International A*, 54(11): 3962.
- King, Margaret C. 1993. *Academic Advising: Organizing and Delivering Services for Student Success*. New York: Jossey – Bass.
- Lambertze, Jean Gloria. 1998. An Analysis of Performance Gap Scores as Measured by the Student Satisfaction Inventory: The Relationship to Retention. *Dissertation*

A Field Study on Registration and Academic Advising Problems at the University Level

*Jawdat A.Saadeh, Gazi J. Khalifeh and Mohamad K. Alyah **

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at defining registration and academic advising problems facing university students, due to sex, college and the type of university programs (Day time, and evening).

The sample of the study consisted of (864) students enrolled at Al-Isra Private University in Amman-Jordan. A (39) items Likart-scale questionnaire has been developed by the researchers and distributed to the sample.

To answer the questions of the study and to test its hypotheses, the researchers used means, standard deviations, "t" test, ANOVA and Tukey method. The results showed the following:

1. Most of the registration problems were too high as perceived by students .
2. There were two academic advising problems that were too high according to the students' responses: the time allocated by the academic advisor to students for advising them, and the academic advisor did not have any idea about the student's social, economical and cultural background before advising him.
3. There were no statistical differences between means of male and female students' responses on the registration procedures items and the academic advisor items of the questionnaire.
4. There were no statistical differences between means of the students' responses on the academic advisor items of the questionnaire according to the college variable.
5. There were no statistical differences between means of the students' responses on the registration procedure items of the questionnaire, according to the college variable.
6. There were statistical differences between means of the students' responses on the academic advisor items of the questionnaire; between students of the administrative sciences college and their colleagues of the engineering college, in favour of administrative sciences college students, where as there were no statistical differences between any of two other colleges.
7. There were no statistical differences between means of the students' responses on the items related to problems of academic advising, problems of registration procedures and the questionnaire as a whole, according to the type of university programs (Day time program or evening program).

Keywords: Registration Problems – Academic Advising Problems – University.

* Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Graduate Studies. Received on 27/5/2005 and Accepted for Publication on 31/5/2006.